REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-21 were pending in this application at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Of these claims, claims 1, 12-16, 18 and 21 have been amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

U.S.C. 101 Rejections:

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed towards non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to recite a computer-readable medium, which is a type of machine-readable medium. Thus, the invention is not related to processing signals, but rather to a tangible medium embodying executable computer code which, when executed, performs certain functions. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections:

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,898,618 to Slaughter et al. (hereinafter "Slaughter"). Claims 6, 8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter in view of U.S. Patent 6,980,993 to Horvitz et al. (hereinafter "Horvitz"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The independent claims recites a "method for delivering data to at least one data-handling device" comprising the following three steps: "i. storing data that is intended for transmission to the data-handling device according to a predetermined template which provides a plurality of fields, each of the fields being capable of containing a portion of the data", "ii. storing mappings that map the data within the fields of the predetermined template to fields within alternative templates should it be determined that the data-handling device is not capable of handling data held in the predetermined template" and "iii. transmitting the

data to the data-handling device." (claim 1; similar language appears in independent claims 9, 10, 16 and 18-21).

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner does not teach all of the features of the invention as claimed in the independent claims. The invention as claimed in the independent claims includes the mapping of data to a template, or to alternate templates from the data mapped in the predetermined template, if the predetermined template is not capable of being utilized with the data-handling device. To that extent, the Office tries to utilize Slaughter to teach the feature of "providing mappings that map the data within the fields of the predetermined template" by referring to the following:

> "The client may map the data elements to corresponding presentation elements from the schema, and may use the information in the presentation element corresponding to each data element to format and present the data element. In one embodiment, a display service may perform the mapping and displaying of data elements on behalf of the client." (column 87, lines 55-60)

However, there is no teaching or indication in Slaughter that the data can be mapped to fields within alternative templates from the presentation elements from the schema, should it be determined that the data-handling device is not capable of handling data in the predetermined template. Rather, the Office refers to the negotiation of capabilities of services through the agreement of service parameters to teach mapping from one template to another:

> "The service may then customize results based on the parameters negotiated with the client. For example, a client that is capable of one bit display at a resolution of 160×200 may negotiate these parameters to the service, thus allowing the service to customize results for the client." (column 35, lines 30-40)

However, this is in no way equivalent to mapping data from fields in a predetermined template to fields within alternative templates to fields within alternative templates. In fact, there is no suggestion or teaching in Slaughter that once a presentation schema is chosen,

another could be utilized, and data could be re-mapped. This disclosure of Slaughter instead asserts that a template is predetermined through negotiations between a client and a service. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of a re-negotiation of a template in Slaughter, let alone remapping of data. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Slaughter fails to contain, teach, or disclose "providing mappings that map the data within the fields of the predetermined template to fields within alternative templates should it be determined that the data-handling device is not capable of handling data held in the predetermined template." Thus, Slaughter fails to teach all of the features of the instant invention. If this rejection is maintained, the Office is respectfully requested to point out where these features are found in Slaughter.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a <u>whole</u>. As mentioned above, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Horvitz fails to make up for the deficiencies of Slaughter as detailed above. Specifically, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Horvitz of "providing mappings that map the data within the fields of the predetermined template to fields within alternative templates should it be determined that the data-handling device is not capable of handling data held in the predetermined template," as required by the independent claims. Thus, if this rejection is maintained, the Office is respectfully requested to point out where these features are found in either Slaughter or Horvitz.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.25. Additionally, charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 through § 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 17, 2007 (Monday)

By _(signature)_ (Reg. 59597)

For/William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399